REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 22 have been amended to conform to U.S. format, to correct several inadvertent typographical errors and to clearly differentiate the present invention over teachings of Barker et al. which are not related to alloimmune diseases. Claims 3, 9-11, 13-15, 17, 18 and 23 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added by these amendments and entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 have been subjected to the following Restriction Requirement:

Group I, claims 1-16 and 18-21, drawn to a pharmaceutical comprising an immunologically effective epitope of a rhesus protein, peptides of rhesus protein and their use in the manufacture of a medicament;

Group II, claim 17, drawn to a method of tolerizing a subject comprising a peptide of a rhesus protein;

Group III, claim 22, drawn to an in vitro method of determining the effect of one or more epitopes from a rhesus protein on a human lymphocyte; and

Group IV, claim 23, drawn to a method of determining the propensity of a RhD negative subject to produce anti-D antibodies after exposure to RhD positive blood.

The Examiner suggests that Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature. In particular, the Examiner suggests that usefulness of epitopes derived from Rhesus D and Cc/Ee proteins in immunotherapy and in the induction of immune responses has been described in Table 3 in particular of Barker et a. (Blood 1997 90(7):2701-2715) and in Stott et al. (Blood 1998 92(10), part 1, supplement 1, page 25A).

It is respectfully pointed out that the reference of Stott et al. is the inventors own work and was published less than one year before the priority date of the instant application. Therefore Stott et al. is not a valid prior art reference with respect to the instant application.

Further, Applicants have amended the claims herein to be drawn to methods for administering to a subject an immunologically effective epitope of a rhesus protein to prevent alloimmunisation and to immunosuppress a response elicited by alloimmunisation in a subject. The claims as amended are clearly linked by a single general inventive concept, in particular prevention of or immunosuppression of a response elicited by alloimmunisation, which is neither taught nor suggested by Barker et al.

Accordingly reconsideration of this Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to the claims.

In an earnest effort to be completely responsive, however, Applicants elect Group I, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12, 16 and 19-21, with traverse.

Applicants believe that the foregoing comprises a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and subsequent allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kathleen A. Tyrrell/

Kathleen A. Tyrrell
Registration No. 38,350

Date: **July 3, 2006**

Licata & Tyrrell P.C.
66 E. Main Street
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 810-1515